

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

5,963,280; hereafter “Okuda”). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan in view of Hamada, Meadows, Inou and Takatori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,592; hereafter “Takatori”). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan in view of Hamada, Meadows, Inou and Yamagata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,024; hereafter Yamagata).

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner indicating that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to hold in abeyance the rewriting of this claim until the Examiner has had the opportunity to reconsider the rejected parent claims in light of the arguments presented below in support of the Applicant's traverse of the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 15 would not have been rendered obvious in view of the combined references.¹ In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “a touch panel disposed on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of said liquid-crystal display panel”, wherein said touch panel comprises at least one pair of electrodes disposed to be opposite to each and separated by a gap”, as recited in independent claim 1. Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “disposing a touch

¹ In order to be directed to unpatentable (i.e., obvious) subject matter, either (1) the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination, or (2) the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in the light of the teachings of the references.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

panel comprising at least a pair of electrodes opposite to each other through a gap on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid-crystal display panel”, as recited in independent claim 15.

As in the previous Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Colgan “fail[s] to disclose the electrode for the touch panel structure, required electrode location for the touch panel and the gap structure in the touch panel.” However, the Examiner now asserts that these features of the claimed invention which are missing from Colgan are disclosed by Hamada and Meadow, although the Examiner does not cite any specific portions of the patent specifications or drawings. In particular, the Examiner asserts that “Hamada discloses a stacked display device with folded substrate where the electrode structure for the [claimed] touch panel is disclosed.” Further, the Examiner asserts that “Meadows discloses an integrated liquid crystal display and optical touch panel where the required electrode location for the touch panel structure is disclosed.” (November 19 Office Action at page 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that it is quite clear that neither Hamada nor Meadows discloses a touch panel disposed on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid crystal display panel. Meadows teaches a touch panel disposed on the visual side of a liquid crystal display panel 12 formed by glass plates 14 and 15, liquid crystal material 13 sealed between the plates 14 and 15, row electrodes 22 disposed on the visual side of the plate 15, and column electrodes 16 disposed on the back side of the plate 14. In particular, Meadows teaches the touch panel formed on top of the liquid crystal display panel 12 (i.e., on the visual side of the plate 15) is utilized to detect the position of a stylus 86 based on the stylus 86 blocking light which is transmitted in the space between a top mirror 82 and the liquid crystal display panel 12

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

(i.e., on the visual side of the liquid crystal display panel 12). That is, when the stylus 86 blocks the light transmitted along the space between the top mirror 82 and the liquid crystal display panel 12, the X and Y light detectors 70 and 64 receive little or no light for the pixel position corresponding to the position of the stylus 86.

Further, Hamada teaches a stacked display device having a touch input panel stacked on the front surface of a liquid crystal display panel on an observation/visual side. For example, as show in Figure 2B, a touch input panel 32 which is disposed on a visual side of a liquid crystal display panel 31.

Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that the other cited references do not teach or suggest a touch panel disposed on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid-crystal display panel, as claimed.

Lastly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify and/or combine the reference teachings to produce the claimed invention wherein a touch panel disposed on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid-crystal display panel.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15, as well as dependent claims 2-14, should be allowable because the applied references, alone or combined, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q64129